

CITY OF MUSKEGON  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES

**February 15, 2018**

Vice Chairman B. Larson called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and roll was taken.

MEMBERS PRESENT: T. Michalski, F. Peterson, B. Larson, B. Mazade, J. Doyle, S. Gawron, J. Montgomery-Keast, M. Hovey-Wright

MEMBERS ABSENT: E. Hood, excused

STAFF PRESENT: M. Franzak, H. Mitchell

OTHERS PRESENT: J. Rooks, 75 W. Walton; D. Kamps, 1885 N. Buys Rd.; L. Spataro, 1567 6<sup>th</sup>; B. Krick, 1762 Jefferson; Dr. R. Hilt, 1627 Jefferson; F. Farmer; 1668 Jefferson; Q. Tiffany, 1694 Jefferson; L. & R. Doctor, 1706 Sanford; D. Manley, 4290 Eastlake Dr; B. Lowry, 4080 Oak Hollow Ct; A. Cirner, 1729 Huizenga; E. Seifert, 297 W Clay; D. Foster, 135 Ottawa; J. Slack, 1472 Marquette; G. Adams, 2112 Sampson; S. Orey, 3060 Sherwood; R. King, 3393 Fulton; K. Johnson, 1281 Montgomery.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion to approve the Minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of December 14, 2017 was made by J. Doyle, supported by J. Montgomery-Keast and unanimously approved.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Hearing, Case 2018-01:** Request for a departure from Section 2003.07 of the form based code section of the zoning ordinance to forego the rooftop mechanical equipment screening requirements at 285 W Western Ave, by Parkland Muskegon, Inc. The property is zoned Form Based Code, Neighborhood Context Area (FBC-NC). Section 2003.07 of the code states “All rooftop mechanical, communication and similar devices shall be screened from view of adjacent properties and streets. Screening shall be so designed as to be an integral part of the building. The screening shall match the buildings material and color or be another material or color that is compatible with the building exterior.” There is mechanical equipment on the tallest roof on the building, above the 8<sup>th</sup> floor. However, this equipment is not required to be screened because it is not visible from the street. There is another roof on the building, above a portion of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, and this area has air conditioning units on it that are visible from Western Ave and Jefferson St. The applicant is seeking a departure to forego these screening requirements so that the tenants in the two apartments near this equipment will have a better view out of the building. It is possible that the future development of the adjacent property to the east will create somewhat of a screen to this equipment from the road; however, a parking lot is planned for the southern portion of this

property. Most of the equipment would still be visible from Jefferson St. Notice was sent to all property owners/tenants within 300 feet of this property and no comments were received. Staff recommends small individual white screens in front of each unit, or some type of painting or white casing over each unit that will blend them in with the building; something that would still allow views from the apartments but also provide a partial screening of the equipment.

J. Rooks stated that the pictures that were included in the members' meeting packet were the views from inside the units which was his primary concern due to the blocking of the view from inside of the units. There were discussions of individual screening of the air conditioning units. He discussed the permits and any changes would be a life safety issue from what he had originally submitted. He went over the different views and how the screening would be minimal in blocking the different views from the adjacent properties. He shared pictures of different view of adjacent properties as well as pictures of a metal mesh that could be attached to each air conditioner on one side and would look like the screening and the holes wouldn't be seen as well as they would be white. He also provided pictures of the air conditioners and asking that they be left as is. J. Montgomery-Keast asked for clarification of the photo in regards to the vacant lot and the area of Jefferson St. J. Rooks explained how he and another adjacent property owner were using this section for parking and the City owns a strip that 60 feet deep along Western and he believed the an offer had been made on it for development. F. Peterson explained the lot is 60 feet deep and the full length of Western Ave. but an offer had not been made for this City owned portion yet. M. Hovey-Wright asked if Mr. Rooks considered using the same type of screening on the Jefferson St. side as the units weren't attractive to look at. Mr. Rooks stated that he would not as it isn't as noticeable on that side of the building.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by B. Mazade, supported by J. Doyle and unanimously approved.

There was discussion on the screening of the units in regards to the pictures that were provided at the meeting. Mr. Rooks stated that they would need to be about an inch away from the units. M. Franzak stated that the ordinance states that the units have to be screened with the same color so it would blend in. The units already have a screen over them and if they were painted to match; it would look better. Mr. Rooks agreed and was willing to paint the screens to match.

A motion that the request for a departure from Section 2003.07 of the form based code section of the zoning ordinance to forego the rooftop mechanical equipment screening requirements at 285 W Western Ave be approved with the painting of the screens to be white, was made by M. Hovey-Wright, supported by J. Montgomery-Keast and unanimously approved with F. Peterson, B. Larson, B. Mazade, J. Doyle, S. Gawron, M. Hovey-Wright, and J. Montgomery-Keast voting aye.

**Hearing, Case 2018-02:** Request to rezone the property at 1698 Sanford St from R-2, Medium-Density Single-Family Residential district to RM-1, Low-Density Multiple-Family Residential district, by Step Up.

**Hearing, Case 2018-03:** Request to allow a non-profit organization that focuses on assisting young adults that have recently aged out of the foster care system transition to independent living in an RM-1, Low Density Multiple Family Residential district at 1698 Sanford St, contingent upon the successful rezoning of the property, by Step Up. The applicant is requesting to utilize the home as a non-profit agency that provides housing and mentoring to young adults that have aged out of

foster care. It would house up to six male participants along with a live-in mentor. Please see the enclosed letter provided by Step Up. Last year this organization was approved for the woman's version of this program at 1319 Peck St, in an RM-1, Low Density Multiple Family district. This request requires a rezoning to multi-family and a special use permit. The property is zoned R-2, Medium Density Single Family Residential. The properties to the east, along Peck St, are zoned RM-1, Low Density Multiple Family. The house measure 3,146 sf and has seven bedrooms and three bathrooms. It was formerly used as a state-licensed adult foster care home. The adjacent property to the north at 1690 Sanford was previously as well. The Rescue Mission's Woman's Shelter is located behind this property to the east. All twelve properties on this block are conforming as single-family homes. Eleven of the twelve homes on this block are single-family owner-occupied, which depicts strong neighborhood characteristics, investment and involvement among the community. Notice was sent to all property owners/tenants within 300 feet of this property. Staff had received two calls that were against the request. Lawrence and Robyn Doctor, the next-door neighbors, at 1706 Sanford St and Ray and Jackie Hilt at 1627 Jefferson St are all opposed to the specific use and the intrusion of multi-family to the neighborhood. The Master Plan calls for action to keep single-family owner-occupied neighborhoods intact. While the property is adjacent to a multi-family district, which is often used as support of a rezoning, it is clear that this area has been kept intact over the years as a singly family neighborhood and was able to avoid the conversion to multi-family that was prevalent in many areas downtown in previous generations. While Step Up provides great services and has shown to be an asset to the area at their Peck St. location (no police reports since opening), the rezoning to multi-family would permanently designate this home for multi-family use, regardless of the owner. Staff recommends denial of the rezoning.

D. Kamps described what the program does as well as what the requirements are that the residents must commit to. He described the home on Peck St. This location opened September 2016. They purchased this location for woman. He discussed the upgrades that were performed to the structure and how they have kept to the historic nature of the home by painting it. Since their upgrades to this structure there have been upgrades to the two houses to the south of this home.

T. Michalski arrived at 4:18 p.m.

D. Kamps did make a correction that the proposed amount of people would be four men with one house manager for 1698 Sanford if this were approved. M. Hovey-Wright asked if there had been any incidents at the home for women. D. Kamps stated that there hadn't been. M. Franzak confirmed that he had checked to see if there were any police reports for the Peck St. location in the past year and there hadn't been any. J. Montgomery-Keast had asked why the applicant felt this home would meet their needs and if they had considered other homes in other areas as well. D. Kamps stated that this location was near other facilities, bus lines, and the City of Muskegon's central location and with the size and layout of the structure along with the price; met their needs. T. Michalski admitted that this is a tough decision for him. The program is a valuable program. The program is not catered for juveniles that are caught up in the system and need help. His concerns are for maintaining the History of the Jefferson neighborhood and this type of use seemed to be in the center of Muskegon. He suggested that there may be other areas/communities that could support this use as there are the same amenities as well as the bus system located within them. He is not opposed to the program as the program is a good program and there is a need for this type of program.

L. Spataro, Nelson Neighborhood Improvement Association, stated that they have no issues with

the Step Up program and that the house on Peck St. was zoned for this type of use. He shared the history of a Victorian mansion that had been located in this area and was deeded to senior citizens. As the times changed; the structure ended up being demolished as it was no longer needed to house the senior citizens. He went over the history of zoning and the changes that were made over the years. This particular home is a single-family home and has concerns with the values of the other homes in the surrounding areas if this were changed when it is compared with other single-family homes. He suggested trying to find a way to allow this use in the current zoning as opposed to changing the zoning. Should the zoning change and this use end up leaving this structure; anything that would be allowed in the zoning district would be allowed. He suggested looking at allowing a special use permit for this zoning district to allow the use as more stipulations may be placed and should the use discontinue; it may be removed. He also suggested looking at a possible overlay district. He would rather have the request tabled so other avenues may be reviewed. B. Larson asked M. Franzak to explain the details for this request as opposed to leaving the zoning and having this as a special use permit instead. M. Franzak stated that the criteria for a special use permit would have to be met. When considering a special use permit for this type of use in a single-family zoning district may not be the best for all the single-family zoning districts. By allowing a special use permit for this type of use; it would then be allowed in all the single-family zoning districts throughout the City and some areas may not be the best place for this type of use.

B. Krick stated he could see this structure from the east window of his home. He does understand the necessity of the program, but he believes there is a better location than the location proposed. Dr. R. Hilt also had some concerns with the location. He is fond of Mr. Kamps and the organization. His biggest concern is the change of zoning because it becomes something that is there forever. This could be detrimental to the neighborhood. This neighborhood has been having many houses being rehabbed. He doesn't feel this use would be good for this neighborhood and not necessarily in the Nelson Neighborhood. F. Farmer added that he has lived in his homes on Jefferson for 45 years and has seen the changes. He is concerned with the domino effect this may have on the neighborhood and adjacent properties. He has concerns when larger homes end up being broken up into multiple units. He would like the commission to vote against the rezoning. Q. Tiffany has his home currently up for sale and his realtor did inform him that this type of use could affect his property. He has had offers on his home from people wanting to put an office in the home. He turned the offers down. He would like to see the commission vote against the rezoning. L. & R. Doctor stated that they have lived in their home for 30 years and has seen the slow changes. The lady's rescue Mission is adjacent to their property and they listen to the foul language that the women use while their children are outside playing at the Mission. They have had some women from the Mission approach them for cash or to use their phone. In the past there had been adult foster care at the location which was governed by the State, so the City couldn't do anything about it. He is thankful that this type of endeavor does fall under the City's purview and would like to see it voted down. B. Lowry described what a family is and how the Step Up's program helps create family for those that really don't have it. He understands the issues that were discussed when it came to the zoning. He was also pleased that no one had said anything bad about the program itself. L. Spataro stated that they were not against helping children in need because the need is real. The solution is not to change the zoning for this property because no one knows what will happen in the future. He didn't want to see any damage caused in this area of single-family housing. He felt that there should be something that would be more creative than a rezoning.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by T. Michalski, supported by J. Montgomery-

Keast and unanimously approved.

T. Michalski would like to see this request for rezoning be tabled until March so staff may have time to see if there is a more creative way for this use to be located here as opposed to having the property rezoned due to what may happen to the property in the future.

A motion that the request to rezone the property at 1698 Sanford St from R-2, Medium-Density Single-Family Residential district to RM-1, Low-Density Multiple-Family Residential district, be tabled until March so staff may look at a different way that this use may work within the zoning without having to rezone the property such as an overlay district, was made by T. Michalski, supported by M. Hovey-Wright and failed with T. Michalski and M. Hovey-Wright voting aye and F. Peterson, B. Larson, B. Mazade, J. Doyle, S. Gawron, and J. Montgomery Keast voting nay.

Discussion continued with B. Mazade stating that a compromised solution would make sense and that rezoning this property would have a lifetime effect and would allow for more principle uses that could impact the neighborhood later. M. Hovey-Wright added that there is a need for this use as the Webster House had closed years ago and she knows the good that programs like this can do but there are other locations that would be better than the property on Sanford with public amenities that are available.

A motion that the request to rezone the property at 1698 Sanford St from R-2, Medium-Density Single-Family Residential district to RM-1, Low-Density Multiple-Family Residential district, be recommended to the City Commission for denial was made by B. Mazade, supported by F. Peterson and unanimously approved with T. Michalski, F. Peterson, B. Larson, B. Mazade, J. Doyle, S. Gawron, J. Montgomery-Keast, and M. Hovey Wright voting aye.

B. Mazade felt that the commission should take action on the special use permit because the City Commission could decide to approve the rezoning request. Commission and staff discussed whether or not the denial of the rezoning request for this property would be required to continue to the City Commission for final approval or denial. It was unclear if the Zoning Enabling act would require a denial recommendation of a rezoning request by the Planning Commission would be required to go before the City Commission. Planning Commissioners and staff concurred that the special use permit should still be considered. B. Mazade added that if the Special Use request was denied; it would make the rezoning request moot.

**Hearing, Case 2018-03: Request to allow a non-profit organization that focuses on assisting young adults that have recently aged out of the foster care system transition to independent living in an RM-1, Low Density Multiple Family Residential district at 1698 Sanford St, contingent upon the successful rezoning of the property, by Step Up.** This is for the discussion and motion. Staff report is listed with the rezoning request above.

D. Manley, Realtor, felt that granting a special use permit under the current zoning for this property wouldn't affect any appraisals for this area. He brought up Terrace Point's appraisals were coming in lower than expected. He didn't understand why the neighbors would have an issue with this use as the program is a good program. He could understand the property not being rezoned; but there should be allowances for uses such as this. He suggested allowing the use for a year to see how

this program works in this neighborhood. B. Larson had brought up that the special use permit would be contingent upon the successful rezoning of the property. B. Mazade added that the City Commission could approve the rezoning even if the Planning Commission recommended denial of it and B. Larson concurred that a motion on the special use permit should be made.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by B. Mazade, supported by J. Doyle and unanimously approved.

A motion that the request to allow a non-profit organization that focuses on assisting young adults that have recently aged out of the foster care system transition to independent living in an RM-1, Low Density Multiple Family Residential district at 1698 Sanford St, be denied was made by B. Mazade, supported by S. Gawron and unanimously approved with T. Michalski, F. Peterson, B. Larson, B. Mazade, J. Doyle, S. Gawron, J. Montgomery-Keast and M. Hovey-Wright voting aye.

**Hearing, Case 2018-05:** Staff-initiated request to amend Section 2330 of the zoning ordinance to create a Medical Marijuana Facilities Overlay District. Staff has prepared the proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance for the Medical Marijuana Facilities Licensing Act (proposed as Section 2330 of the zoning ordinance). The proposed amendments only relate to the zoning designations related to the Medical Marijuana Facilities Licensing Act (MMFLA) Ordinance that will eventually be proposed to the City Commission for approval into the City Code of Ordinances at a later date. Please note that the MMFLA Ordinance will have to be approved before the zoning designations are approved. This review by the Planning Commission is intended to provide the City Commission with a recommendation as to where these facilities should be allowed, should the new MMFLA Ordinance be adopted by the City Commission as part of the City Code of Ordinances. Please see the enclosed proposed MMFLA Ordinance that references amending Chapter 34, Article IV of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Muskegon. Please also see enclosed the proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance: Section 2330 – Medical Marijuana Facilities Overlay District.

1. Definitions for the types of MMFLA facilities are as follows:

***Grower*** means an MMFLA licensee that is a commercial entity located in this state that cultivates, dries, trims, cures or packages marihuana for sale to a Processor or Provisioning Center.

***Processor*** means an MMFLA licensee that is a commercial entity located in this state that purchases marihuana from a Grower and that extracts resin from the marihuana or creates a marihuana-infused product for sale and transfer in package form to a Provisioning Center.

***Provisioning Center*** means an MMFLA licensee that is a commercial entity located in this state that purchases marihuana from a Grower or Processor and sells, supplies, or provides marihuana to registered qualify patients, directly or through the patients' registered primary caregivers. Provisioning Center includes any commercial property where marihuana is sold at retail to registered qualifying patients or registered primary caregivers. A noncommercial location used by a primary caregiver to assist a qualifying patient connected to the caregiver through the department's marihuana registration

process in accordance with the MMMA is not a Provisioning Center for purposes of the MMFLA or this section.

***Secure Transporter*** means an MMFLA licensee that is a commercial entity located in this state that transports marihuana, with or without storage, between Marihuana Facilities for a fee.

***Safety Compliance Facility*** means an MMFLA licensee that is a commercial entity that receives marihuana from a Marihuana Facility or registered primary caregiver, tests it for contaminants and for tetrahydrocannabinol and other cannabinoids, returns the test results, and may return the marihuana to the Marihuana Facility.

Staff recommends approval of the ordinance amendment.

T. Michalski stated that there had been a lengthy conversation at a prior Commission meeting regarding this and what the role of the Planning Commission was. His understanding was that the City was going to determine whether or not they would have dispensaries and then determine where they would go. Now the Planning Commissioners are looking at this in reverse and looking at where they should go before determining if the City was going to allow for dispensaries or if the State was going to even issue more licenses. He had concerns about possibly wasting their time looking at this now. M. Franzak stated that the City Commission wasn't comfortable with voting on whether to allow it until it was determined where they would go. F. Peterson added that staff had asked for more time to see what other cities were also doing. This was then going to be brought back to the City Commission in March or early April. Staff felt this would be a necessary step to bring this before the Planning Commission with a strong understanding of where this would be acceptable to the City Commission. The City Commission didn't want to approve it if there was a chance it could be anywhere but wanted to see it in more of a defined district. This would need to be approved at the Planning Commission, City Commission and then the State levels. By starting with the Planning Commission; this will allow for a stronger understanding of a defined district. M. Hovey-Wright stated that she tried looking for the areas and wasn't sure of the locations based on the map that was supplied in their packets. The places she looked had structures that looked like they should be removed. She stated it made sense to consolidate the areas. B. Mazade asked about the proposed District 2 having two locations that are not contiguous. M. Franzak confirmed that there were two due to the residential neighborhood in the middle. J. Montgomery-Keast asked if there were any churches in the proposed areas. M. Franzak stated that to his knowledge there wasn't but churches do come and go in different commercial sites.

A. Cirner stated that he was a Planning Commissioner in Palm Springs, CA and had worked on this issue there. He had moved here almost a year ago and would like to offer his services to help the City when it comes to this type of planning and ordinance language as he had been through it already and he is familiar with mistakes that other municipalities have made and would like to help make sure no mistakes are made. He does feel that this planning should be brought together at this juncture. B. Larson stated that this is about the districts at this time. A. Cirner stated that churches, schools, etc. should be researched before looking at locations. He would like to help out with work sessions regarding this and to reach out to the other communities that have gone through this already. E. Seifert is passionate about this. He described his personal experience regarding his wife and himself and their need for this. His wife had passed away two years ago. Medical Marihuana

has helped his wife get off some of her medications. He to had obtained a Medical Marihuana license for his health issues and it helped him better than any other medications that he had been on. There are many buildings that are not feasible for this type of use; but other areas may need to be looked at and it shouldn't be restricted. He is also willing to help with this to ensure it is done accurately. D. Foster stated that she had spoken on this about eight years ago. This is about the patients and getting them comfortable and some of the locations aren't feasible. The places need to be easily accessible and making patients comfortable. She felt the districts could be in nicer areas. She felt that the proposed areas aren't aesthetically pleasing or inviting. It took her two and a half months to find her facility and when she was looking; she looked at accessibility, what the structure looked like and handicap accessibility. J. Slack stated that he is a young entrepreneur and was born and raised in Muskegon. He stated that 50% of the taxes go back to the local municipality for the schools, etc. He would like to get into this industry. G. Adams stated that the overlay districts are a good start and is necessary. He wanted to locate his business here. He had sold one of his facilities that he had in Lansing. There are a lot of people that would want to invest in this. He would like to have a facility here and not just be a caregiver. He had brought up how he has worked with Muskegon Heights for having properties zoned correctly and are hashing out the language now. S. Orley had done research into cancer and Parkinson while in college. He would like to bring his services to Muskegon as well. He owns an old building on E. Apple that is located next to Dominoes. He has patients that he has to deliver to. He spoke with Ann Meisch regarding the number of growers located in Muskegon and he doesn't believe there have been any issues with any of them. R. King is happy to see that the City is looking at having dispensaries in Muskegon. This is medicine and she isn't sure that segregating dispensaries in the industrial areas is a good choice. Marihuana businesses are highly regulated, so this type of business isn't something that just anyone can get into and it is expensive to get started. She stated that Ann Arbor has 18 dispensaries with four dispensaries in the prime downtown business district.

M. Hovey-Wright left at 5:40 p.m.

M. Franzak added that he received over 100 inquiries and given input and offered help with writing the ordinance. He brought up how the City started out with caregivers who grow out of their homes and there had been no issues. Now there are commercial and industrial areas where growers are located. K. Johnson shared a spreadsheet from when medical marihuana was approved by the voters in 2008 which was the highest voter turnout. Every precinct was in favor of this. He shared other positive information regarding the need and how helpful it is medically. This is a continuing positive when it comes to zoning and this is the next best step. He is also a caregiver. This is widely supported. The State is saying that local municipalities can opt in and choose where it will go within their municipalities. He did have concerns with the proposed locations. He felt the ordinance could be crafted in a way that it could be in other areas. He has been to the different neighborhood association meetings to discuss this and he has had feedback from Beachwood/Bluffton to Marquette neighborhoods and they feel these shouldn't be segregated in a small area; but should be more spread out to accommodate more. The proposed area is on the bus route so it is accessible to people where it is proposed. He feels they should be allowed to be near pharmacies or other medical areas. There have been studies that show that deaths from opioids have declined since the approval of medical marihuana. He believes that staff's proposal is a good start but would like to see it spread to other areas as well.

F. Peterson left at 5:50 p.m.



A motion to close the public hearing was made by B. Mazade, supported by J. Montgomery-Keast and unanimously approved.

A motion that the request to amend Section 2330 of the zoning ordinance, to allow for a Medical Marihuana Facilities Overlay District, be recommended to the City Commission for approval, was made by T. Michalski, supported by S. Gawron and was approved with T. Michalski, B. Larson, J. Doyle, S. Gawron voting aye and B. Mazade and J. Montgomery-Keast voting nay.

**Hearing, Case 2018-04:** Staff-initiated request to vacate Market St between Western Avenue and Terrace St. The Farmers Market currently hosts many events that utilize a temporary liquor license. The City has to apply for a temporary liquor license with the State of Michigan every time an event is held. A permanent license is available, but it cannot be utilized across a public street. Vacating the street would solve the problem and the liquor license could be used in the designated area, which would include the building and the street and a small area across of the street near the stage. Please see the map below that depicts the approximate area that the liquor license could be used. The City would still maintain the street as a public street but vacating it would allow for more flexibility for closure during special events. There are no plans to close the street other than temporarily for events, as it currently happens. Staff sent notices to all property owners adjacent to Market St and had not received any comments at the time of this writing. Staff recommends approval of the street vacation.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by T. Michalski, supported by S. Gawron and unanimously approved.

A motion that the request to vacate Market St, between Western Avenue and Terrace St, be recommended to the City Commission for approval was made by J. Doyle, supported by S. Gawron and unanimously approved, with T. Michalski, B. Larson, B. Mazade, J. Doyle, S. Gawron, and J. Montgomery-Keast voting aye.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

None

## **OLD BUSINESS**

None.

## **OTHER**

B. Mazade asked for an update on the cell tower issue. M. Franzak stated that the proposal is ready for the March meeting.

B. Mazade asked for an update on the former Nims School building. M. Franzak stated that it would be coming back as they would like to demolish the gym for additional parking. They will

also be adding an urban farm in the back, but it won't need approval and they want to move the pocket park to another location on the property and then the City can sell the property to them.

B. Mazade asked for an update on the planning process with Pure Muskegon. M. Franzak stated that he would try to get the schematics, but he wasn't sure if they wanted it made public yet. B. Mazade was also interested in when they would be back before the planning commission.

J. Doyle asked for an update in regard to Melching and the storing of aggregate at their new location. M. Franzak stated that Melching needs the Drain Commissioner's approval first but he hasn't applied yet. Staff also put them in contact with another chemical company so there is a chance that the buildings could be saved.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

HM